

## In the Supreme Court of the Hawaiian Islands.

March Term, 1896.

WONG LEONG, CHING SUI, YIM QUON, SAM SING WAI COMPANY, KANEHOE RANCH COMPANY, Limited, KAULA (W) and KALIKO KELLY (W) v. W. G. IRWIN.

before JUDD, C.J., FREAR and WHITING, JJ.

In proceedings by lower proprietors to enjoin an upper proprietor from diverting water from various streams in an ahupuaa, held:

- 1) That the evidence is sufficient to show that the defendant does not divert more water than he is entitled by prescription to use on his uncultivated taro lands.
- 2) That, since all the streams from which defendant is entitled to take water for these lands unite before leaving his lands, it is immaterial to the lower proprietors from which of the streams the water is diverted.
- 3) That under the circumstances the plaintiffs have no rights in the seepage water from defendant's taro lands.
- 4) That the water might lawfully be diverted from one ahupuaa to another ahupuaa.

## OPINION OF THE COURT, BY FREAR, J.

The defendant holds in fee or under lease, with the exception of certain kuleanas and perhaps certain konohiki taro lands, the various lands comprised in the great basin or amphitheater that forms the upper or southerly portion of the Ahupuaa of Kailua, in the District of Koolau, on the northeastern or windward side of the Island of Oahu. On these lands many small streams take their rise and, augmented by springs along their courses and uniting at various points with each other, all finally become one large stream at a point near the center of the lower or northerly boundary of this basin. Thence the stream, further increased along its course by other springs as well as by other small streams from other portions of the Ahupuaa of Kailua, flows northerly through this Ahupuaa along some of plaintiffs' taro and rice lands, which it irrigates, and their two rice mills, which it runs, and empties into a large pond, known as Kaelepu, from which the water flows easterly through other rice and taro lands of the plaintiffs, and then, joined by the stream from Kaelepu pond, also in this Ahupuaa, flows northerly and empties into the ocean.

The defendant recently constructed an aqueduct consisting of ditches and flumes, extending several miles from west to east across the upper portion of some of the lands held by him (Maunawili, Alinoni and Makawao), and a tunnel through the ridge which separates the Ahupuaa of Kailua from the adjoining Ahupuaa of Waimanalo, and by means thereof diverts, whenever needed, a portion of the water which formerly flowed in five of the small streams on these lands from points at or near their sources (the springs known as Kapikua and Kailili in Maunawili, Kapuni and Kupe in Makawao, and the Alinoni spring), and conducts this water into Waimanalo, where it is used to irrigate the cane lands of the Waimanalo Sugar Company.

The plaintiffs brought suit before the Water Commissioner of Koolau to enjoin the defendant from thus diverting this water, and the case comes here on their appeal from the refusal of the Commissioner to enjoin such diversion. The defense mainly relied upon is that no more water is diverted than the defendant is entitled by prescription to use upon his now uncultivated taro lands in Kailua, and that the diversion is not injurious to the plaintiffs.

It appears from the maps (Exhibits A, B, D, E, F, H) and title deeds on file, and the testimony of Mr. Wall, the surveyor, that the defendant owns in fee 55.70 acres of taro land now under cultivation, namely, 7.67 acres in Pukaea, 7.49 in Makawao, 6.99 in the western half of Alinoni, 20.21 in Maunawili, 10.63 in Kailua, and 2.71 in lands below the Maunawili Ranch house.

Unfortunately the conditions are such as to render it practically impossible to ascertain by measurement the quantity of water to which the defendant is entitled as owner of these taro lands. Hence recourse was had to the testimony of witnesses as to the relative and actual amounts of water required by cane and taro respectively in other parts of these islands.

Witnesses acquainted with the relative amounts of water required by cane and taro on neighboring lands, and who had transferred water from taro to cane lands, testified that taro requires from three to ten times as much water as cane, the difference in the ratio depending upon whether the taro land is tamped or not, and upon whether it is entitled to a constant or only a periodic supply of water, as well as upon differences of soil, temperature, wind, rainfall and other conditions. Taking the ratio least favorable to the defendant, the water appurtenant to his 55.70 acres of uncultivated taro land should be sufficient for three times that area of cane land, or 167.10 acres.

Again, witnesses familiar with taro cultivation testified that taro requires from eight to twelve inches of water a week; and witnesses familiar with cane cultivation testified that cane requires about three inches of water at a time, three or four times a month. Taking also from these figures those least favorable to the defendant, that is, three inches of water a week for cane and eight for taro, substantially the same result is obtained—that taro requires about three times as much water as cane.

Mr. Chalmers, the manager of the Waimanalo sugar plantation, testified that the water diverted would irrigate from 100 to 125 acres of cane. If so, the water diverted is, according to the above estimates, somewhat less in amount than the defendant is entitled to use upon his uncultivated taro lands. But this testimony is not altogether satisfactory.

The water diverted is not confined to any particular tract of land, but is used indiscriminately with other water upon various fields, and it appears from other testimony of the same witness that far more than 125 acres (perhaps 300 acres) of land is now cultivated in cane because of this accession to the water supply, which would not otherwise be cultivated. The explanation of his testimony as a whole would seem to be that in dry seasons, or if there were but little rain throughout the year, the water diverted would properly irrigate from 100 to 125 acres of cane, but that, perhaps chiefly on account of the abundance of rain in that district, more cane land can be cultivated there than in most other districts with a given amount of water for irrigation, because during a large part of the year but little irrigation (about twice a month) is required, and a comparatively small amount of water can sustain the cane without serious loss through the short dry season, although it could not properly irrigate the same area throughout the year.

Let us, therefore, consider another and more definite and more satisfactory line of investigation. Although the water sufficient for the taro land cannot be measured, that which is diverted can be and has been measured. At a time when the water was high, six inches deep in the flume, Mr. Boyd, a surveyor, found a flow of 1,462,485 gallons in twenty-four hours. Mr. Chalmers testified that it varied from a million to a million and a half gallons a day. The maximum amount, 1,500,000 gallons a day, would cover about 128 acres of cane land three inches deep once a week. This tends to confirm Mr. Chalmers' testimony as to the area that could be properly irrigated with the diverted water if the land depended wholly or chiefly on irrigation. This quantity of water would also cover 55.70 acres of taro land a little less than seven inches deep once a week, that is, seven-eighths of the minimum depth testified to as required by taro lands in various localities and under various conditions.

The particular circumstances in this case would seem to strengthen rather than weaken the force of the conclusions arrived at by the foregoing methods of estimation. It was shown that, by prescriptive right, the taro lands in question need not be tamped and are entitled to a constant flow of water; that such lands require and are entitled to considerably more water than lands that must be tamped and that have water at stated periods only; that the porosity of the soil and prevalence of winds in this part of Kailua are such as to indicate that the loss of water by seepage and evaporation is probably not less there than in most other parts of these islands; that the cane lands at Waimanalo do not require more water than other cane lands which require irrigation; in fact, that cane is irrigated at Waimanalo only about once in two weeks, while in many places it is irrigated oftener—in some places once a week. This is due no doubt chiefly to the fact that Waimanalo is on the windward side of the island, where the rainfall is greater than on the leeward sides of the islands, where irrigation is more frequent. Yet for this reason the taro lands also would require less water by way of irrigation than would be required by similar lands in more arid localities. But the greater the rainfall the less proportionally would be the amount of water required by way of irrigation in the case of cane lands than in the case of taro lands, because of the smaller area of taro land requiring a given amount of water or the greater amount of water required for a given area.

All things considered, therefore, and giving the plaintiffs the benefit of uncertainties, we are of the opinion that the defendant does not divert more water than he is entitled to use upon his uncultivated taro lands.

It is further contended for the plaintiffs that it is unlawful for the defendant to divert, as he now does, from five streams on three lands, the quantity of water that he is entitled to from a larger number of streams on a larger number of lands. But, since all the streams in question unite before leaving his lands, and all the plaintiffs' lands entitled to water are situated below his lands, it is immaterial to them from what stream or streams the water is diverted.

It is also contended that the natural drainage from the taro lands is down the valley, and that by the diversion the plaintiffs are deprived of the seepage that would otherwise reappear at lower points in springs. The topography of Kailua is such that surface water would naturally flow from defendant's towards plaintiffs' lands, but it is entirely uncertain what direction the water would take after leaving the surface. It is not shown that the seepage in defendant's taro lands would take the course of surface waters, or, if it should, that it would reappear in the lower springs, much less that it would flow underground in known and well-defined channels. Subterranean waters, to be the subject of rights, must, like surface waters, in general flow in known and well-defined channels. Gould on Waters, 2d Ed. Secs. 280, 281, citing Davis v. Afong, 5 Haw. 216, and numerous other cases. Nor could a prescriptive right be acquired to mere drainage water under these circumstances whether on the surface or underground. Peck v. Bailey, 8 Haw. 658. At most this would be only a case of *dominium obsequie injuria*.

Finally, it is contended that the water cannot be lawfully transferred from one ahupuaa to another—either by common law or by ancient Hawaiian usage. So far as the argument rests upon the common law, it is based on the doctrine of riparian rights which has no application to the rights now in question, which are prescriptive. Riparian rights are natural rights depending on the ownership of land situated on the bank (ripa) of a stream. Except for certain natural and ordinary purposes, the rights of one proprietor are not in general superior to those of another. The rights of all for purposes of irrigation or other so-called extraordinary purposes are based on the principle of equality and are correlative and

interdependent. Each may take only such an amount of water as is reasonable under all the circumstances. If one takes more than this amount under a claim of right, although no damage might for the time being be caused thereby to the others, because they do not choose to exercise their full rights, yet it would be an injury (*injuria sine damno*) for which they could maintain an action, because otherwise the wrongful user might by long continuance ripen into a right. When once it has thus ripened into a right, it becomes a superior and absolute right, no longer depending upon the location of the land upon the banks of the stream or upon the corresponding rights of others. It may then be utilized in any manner, in any place, for any purpose, so long as no injury is caused thereby to others. The case is somewhat analogous to that of joint tenants of a tract of land. Each may use the common property to a reasonable extent, all things considered, but if one exceeds his rights, as for instance by occupying one portion adversely, the others might well complain even though they should not care to occupy the land themselves, for the time being, for the adverse occupancy might ripen into a right. If once it should thus ripen into a right, it would become a superior, exclusive and absolute right, and the occupier might then use his portion in any way he might please, so long as he did not interfere with the rights of the others in the remaining portion. For their rights in the portion occupied by him would be extinguished. In such case the other proprietors would have no more concern with his rights in his portion than outside third parties would have.

So far as the argument rests upon Hawaiian usage it is based on the statement that such transfers were not made in ancient times. But this is quite different from a statement that such transfers could not be made. So far as they were not made, it was no doubt in most instances because there was no occasion or means for making them, as there is now, with the changed conditions of population and society, the diversification and extension of agricultural industries and the possession of capital and engineering skill and appliances. But we do not know as a fact that such transfers were never made in ancient times. We do know that in some instances, there were several ahupuaas in the same natural water system, all receiving water from the same stream. In this very case several of the defendant's lands are ahupuaas, if the testimony of plaintiffs' witnesses is correct, and yet all belong to the same water system. This is true also of the Kaula water system at Lahaina, Maui, and in the case of Pioneer Mill v. Kumulihili, 10 Haw. —, this Court held that, although by ancient custom each of the numerous ahupuaas in that system was entitled by prescription to water only once in eleven days, yet that the water might be transferred by a kuleana holder in one ahupuaa on his water day to a kuleana on a different ahupuaa which had a different water day, provided the rights of others were not injuriously affected thereby. There is no difference in principle between a transfer from one place to another in the same ahupuaa and a transfer from one ahupuaa to another.

In view of the foregoing it will be unnecessary to consider the question of the application of the doctrine of riparian rights to the conditions existing in Kailua, or in these islands generally, or the interesting arguments and evidence adduced in this case on the supposition that the Court might find it necessary to pass upon this question.

A decree will be signed in accordance with these views, all costs to be divided.

A. S. Hartwell for plaintiffs, Wong Leong, Ching Sui, Yim Quon and Sam Sing Wai Company.

C. Brown for plaintiffs, Kanehoe Ranch Company, Limited, Kaula and Kaliko Kelly.

W. A. Kinney for defendant.

Honolulu, April 25, 1896.

## Board of Health Meeting.

At the regular weekly meeting of the Board of Health yesterday there were present: President Smith, Drs. Wood, Emerson, Day, Wayson, and Messrs. Reynolds, Brown, Keliipo, Lansing and Meyer of the leper settlement.

Under the Act to mitigate, Dr. Monsarrat's report showed eighty-four examinations.

Inspector Keliipo's report showed 50,000 fish examined for the week ending April 27th.

A proposition for a cemetery at Kahauiki was reported on. Matter referred to Agent Reynolds.

A communication was received from a physician of the city telling of the death of a woman from malpractice at the hands of a Chinese physician.

Regulations for the Pauahi and Baldwin homes, at the leper settlement for girls and boys respectively, were adopted with amendments.

Board went into executive session at 5 p. m.

Mr. D. P. Davis, a prominent, liveryman and merchant of Goheen, Va., has this to say on the subject of rheumatism: "I take pleasure in recommending Chamberlain's Pain Balm for rheumatism, as I know from personal experience that it will do all that is claimed for it. A year ago this spring my brother was laid up in bed with inflammatory rheumatism and suffered intensely. The first application of Chamberlain's Pain Balm eased the pain, and the use of one bottle completely cured him." For sale by all druggists and dealers. Benson, Smith & Co., agents for Hawaiian Islands.

## "Success"

IS THE  
PERFECT FILTER!

## BECAUSE:

First—The filtering medium is Tri-poli Stone which does not receive into its pores the filth and germs it extracts and which is always the same, no matter how long in use.

Second—The action of the filter downward, from an upper to a lower jar, passes the water, drop by drop, through the air, restoring the oxygen thereby which the water may have lost from stagnation, confinement, or otherwise, and imparting to it freshness of taste, sparkle and vitality.

Third—Its action is as rapid as is consistent with efficacy. A too rapid filtering does not wholly remove impurities.

Fourth—Every part is accessible for cleaning, and without laborious effort. Thorough cleanliness is the chief requisite of any good filter.

Fifth—The jars being made either of stoneware or porcelain insures water being kept pure and uncontaminated after being filtered.

Sixth—Stoneware for those who desire an efficient yet low-priced filter, and the finest porcelain, decorated to suit, enables the SUCCESS to accommodate itself to the wants of all in the matter of price.

Seventh—Its construction admits also of its capacity being adapted to suit the wants of all, from the individual tourist to the largest hotel or laundry.

Since introducing the Success Filter, we have sold a large number of them, and they give perfect satisfaction.

This cut shows a sectional view of the

### STONEWARE FILTER, Styles 1 and 2.

Set up ready for use. There are two crocks, each of four gallons capacity—an upper one holding the Filter Block as shown, and a lower one, which can be used as a water cooler, if desired.

The block is four inches in diameter by the same in height, and is hollowed out on inside. This fits on a metal tube, which fastens by means of the nut, shown in separate cut, to bottom of Filter Jar. Block can be lifted off tube, cleaned and replaced in two minutes, and with no trouble at all. Water passes from outside of block, through the walls into the hollow chamber, and from thence, by means of the Drip Tube, into the lower receptacle.

## STYLE 1.

## Best Dark-Glazed Stoneware

Family size, as shown with an upper and lower jar, each of four gallons capacity. Hotel or restaurant size, 10-gallon top and bottom crocks, with four blocks (quadruple capacity).

## STYLE 2.

## Best Salt-Glazed Stoneware

Same sizes as style 1.

Try one. To be had of  
**E. O. HALL & SON,**  
AGENTS.

Ask for  
**SWEET MOMENTS**  
AT ANY TIME  
TRADE MARK  
**CLARETTES**  
MANUFACTURED BY  
LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.  
ST. LOUIS, MO. U.S.A.  
Sold Everywhere

**HOLLISTER & COMPANY,**  
Agents for the Hawaiian Islands.  
4273 1749-2m

### Hawaiian Fertilizing Company

Importers, Dealers and Manufacturers of

### All Kinds of Fertilizers

Phosphates,  
Potash  
and Ammonia,

Separately or in Compounds. In quantities to suit. Correspondence and order solicited.

A. F. COOKE, Manager.

COPPER-PLATE PRINTING  
AT GAZETTE OFFICE.

## CASTLE & COOKE, Ltd.,

Life and Fire  
Insurance Ag'ts.

AGENTS FOR

New England Mutual

### LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

Of Boston.

### Fire Insurance Company

Of Hartford.

INSURANCE

### Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd.

AGENTS FOR

### FIRE, LIFE and MARINE INSURANCE.

### Northern Assurance Co

Of London for FIRE &amp; LIFE.

Established 1836.

Accumulated Funds, £3,975,000.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN

### MARINE INSURANCE CO., Ltd.,

Of Liverpool for MARINE.

Capital - - £1,000,000.

Reduction of Rates.

Immediate Payment of Claims.

THEO. H. DAVIES &amp; CO., Ltd., Agents.

### Hamburg-Bremen Fire Insurance Co.

The undersigned having been appointed Agents of the above company are prepared to insure risks against fire on Stone and Brick Buildings and on Merchandise stored thereon on the most favorable terms. For particulars apply at the office of F. A. SCHAEFER & CO., Agents.

General Insurance Company for Sea, River and Land Transport of Bremen.

Having established an agency at Honolulu and the Hawaiian Islands the undersigned General Agents are authorized to take risks against the dangers of the sea at the most reasonable rates and on the most favorable terms.

F. A. SCHAEFER & CO.,  
Agents for the Hawaiian Islands.

### German Lloyd Marine Insurance Co.

OF BERLIN.

### Fortuna General Insurance Company

OF BERLIN.

The above Insurance Companies have established a General Agency here, and the undersigned, General Agents, are authorized to take risks against the dangers of the seas at the most reasonable rates and on the most favorable terms.

F. A. SCHAEFER & CO., Gnl. Agts.

### Krons-Atlantic Fire Insurance Company

OF HAMBURG.

Capital of the company and reserve, reichsmarks 6,000,000  
Capital their reinsurance companies 101,650,000  
Total reichsmarks 107,650,000

### North German Fire Insurance Company

OF HAMBURG.

Capital of the company and reserve, reichsmarks 8,800,000  
Capital their reinsurance companies 35,000,000  
Total reichsmarks 43,800,000

The undersigned, General Agents of the above two companies for the Hawaiian Islands, are prepared to insure Buildings, Furniture, Merchandise and Produce, Machinery, etc., also Sugar and Rice Mills, and Vessels in the harbor, against loss or damage by fire on the most favorable terms.

H. HACKFELD & CO.

### North British and Mercantile INSURANCE COMPANY.

TOTAL ASSETS 31ST DEC., 1894.

£11,671,018 2s. 2d.

1-Authorized Capital, £3,000,000  
Subscribed Capital, £2,750,000  
Paid-up Capital, £87,500 0 0  
2-Fire Funds, £4,410,992 7 3  
3-Life and Annuity Funds, £8,572,525 14 11

£11,671,018 2s. 2d.  
Revenue Fire Branch, £1,546,856 18 7  
Revenue Life and Annuity Branches, £1,359,821 16 9  
£2,906,678 15 4

The accumulated funds of the Fire and Life Departments are free from liability in respect of each other.

ED. HOFFSCHLAGER & CO.,  
Agents for the Hawaiian Islands.

S. T. ALEXANDER H. P. BALDWIN  
**ALEXANDER & BALDWIN**

Commission Merchants,  
NO. 3 CALIFORNIA STREET,  
SAN FRANCISCO

Island Orders Promptly Filled.

## BENSON, SMITH & CO.,

Jobbing and Manufacturing

### PHARMACISTS.

DEALERS IN

### PURE DRUGS,

Chemicals,

### MEDICINAL PREPARATIONS

AND

### Patent Medicines

At the Lowest Prices.

COR. OF FORT AND HOTEL STREETS.

W. H. RICE,

## Stock Raiser

- And Dealer in -

### LIVE STOCK.

- BREEDER OF -

## Fine Horses and Cattle

Well-bred Fresh Milch Cows, and

Young Sussex Bulls,

Fine Saddle and Carriage Horses

### FOR SALE.

Tourists and Excursion Parties desiring Single, Double or Four-in-hand Teams or Saddle Horses can be accommodated at W. H. Rice's Livery Stables.

All Communications to be Addressed to

W. H. RICE,

LIHUE, KAUALA.

## Metropolitan Market

KING STREET.

### Choicest Meats

From Finest Herds.

## G. J. WALLER, Proprietor.

Families and Shipping Supplied

ON SHORT NOTICE

AT THE

### Lowest Market Prices

All Meats delivered from this market are Thoroughly Chilled immediately after killing by means of a Bell-Coleman Patent Dry Air Refrigerator. Meat so treated retains all its juicy properties and is guaranteed to keep longer after delivery than freshly-killed meat.

## Beaver Saloon.

H. J. NOLTE, - Prop.

Begs to announce to his friends and the public in general that he has opened the above saloon, where

### FIRST-CLASS REFRESHMENTS

Will be served from 3 a. m. till 10 p. m., under the immediate supervision of a competent Chef de Cuisine.

THE FINEST GRADES OF

### Tobaccoes,

Cigars, Pipes and

Smokers' Sundries

Chosen by a personal selection from first-class manufacturers has been obtained and will be added to from time to time.

One of Brunswick & Balke's Celebrated Billiard Tables

Connected with the establishment, where lovers of the cue can participate.

## Consolidated Soda Water Works Co.,

LIMITED,

Esplanade, corner Allen and Fort streets,

HOLLISTER &amp; CO., - Agents.